



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
097030,606	02/25/90	XU	210121.4251

DAVID J MAKI
SEED AND BERRY
6300 COLUMBIA CENTER
701 FIFTH AVENUE
SEATTLE WA 98104-7092

HM22/0607

EYLER, Y EXAMINER

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1582	

06/07/99⁷

DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.
09/030,606

Applicant(s)
Xu et al.

Examiner
Yvonne Eyster

Group Art Unit
1642



- ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____
- ☐ This action is **FINAL**.
- ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claims

- ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- ☒ Claims 1-22 are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

- ☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.
- ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.
- ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- ☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been
- ☐ received.
- ☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____
- ☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

- ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____
- ☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

Art Unit: 1642

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - I. Claims 1-4, drawn to methods of detecting prostate cancer by protein binding, classified in class 435, subclass 7.1.
 - II. Claims 5, and 10-16, drawn to monoclonal antibodies, classified in class 530, subclass 387.7.
 - III. Claims 6 and 7, drawn to methods of immunologically treating prostate cancer, classified in class 424, subclass 130.1.
 - IV. Claims 8 and 9, drawn to methods of detecting prostate cancer by PCR amplification, classified in class 435, subclass 6.
 - V. Claims 17, 18, 21, and 22, drawn to nucleic acids, classified in class 536, subclass 24.3 and 24.33.
 - VI. Claims 19 and 20, drawn to methods of detecting prostate cancer by hybridization, classified in class 435, subclass 6.
2. The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:
3. The inventions of Groups I, III, IV, and VI are drawn to entirely different methods having different method steps, requiring different method compositions and uses of those compositions and having different measurable outcomes and goals. Each method requires unique searches and considerations not required for evaluation and performance of any other method.
4. Inventions II and I are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the

Art Unit: 1642

product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case, the antibodies may be used to treat prostate cancer or to purify a protein.

5. Inventions II and III are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case, the antibodies may be used to diagnose prostate cancer or to purify a protein.

6. Inventions V and IV are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case, the oligonucleotides may be used in hybridization assays.

7. Inventions V and VI are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case, the oligonucleotides may be used in PCR amplifications.

Art Unit: 1642

8. The inventions of Groups II and V are drawn to entirely different products having different structures and biological functions and uses.

9. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

10. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and the search required for any single Group is not required for any other Group, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

11. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Additionally, Groups IV, V, and VI contain Claims drawn to nucleotides, nucleotide constructs, and/or methods requiring the use of nucleotides or nucleotide constructs that contain more than ten individual, independent, and distinct nucleotide sequences in alternative form. Accordingly, these claims are subject to restriction under 35 U.S.C. § 121 as outlined in 1192 O.G. 68 (November 19, 1996).

If any of these Groups are elected, applicant is required to specify no more than ten specific nucleotide sequences for examination. This requirement is made under O.G. Notice 1192 O.G. 68 (November 19, 1996), as the examination of more than ten sequences in one application would result in an undue search burden on the PTO. The search of the no more than ten selected

Art Unit: 1642

sequences may include the complements of the selected sequences and, where appropriate, may include subsequences within the selected sequences (*e.g.*, oligomeric probes and/or primers).

12. Groups I, II, and III contain claims directed to patentably distinct species of binding agents and antibodies.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable.

This requirement is necessary as each species is drawn to a unique molecule which does not share biochemical or functional properties with any other molecule.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the

Art Unit: 1642

examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

13. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a petition under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(I).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Yvonne Eyler, Ph.D. whose telephone number is (703) 308-6564. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 830am to 630pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Paula Hutzell, can be reached on (703) 308-4310. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 305-3014 or (703) 308-4242.

Communications via Internet e-mail regarding this application, other than those under 35 U.S.C. 132 or which otherwise require a signature, may be used by the applicant and should be addressed to [paula.hutzell@uspto.gov].


All Internet e-mail communications will be made of record in the application file. PTO employees do not engage in Internet communications where there exists a possibility that sensitive information could be identified or exchanged unless the record includes a properly signed express waiver of the confidentiality requirements of 35 U.S.C. 122. This is more clearly set forth in the Interim Internet Usage Policy published in the Official Gazette of the Patent and Trademark on February 25, 1997 at 1195 OG 89.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

Application/Control Number: 09/030606

Page 7

Art Unit: 1642


Yvonne Eyler
Patent Examiner

Yvonne Eyler, Ph.D.
Patent Examiner
June 4, 1999